Remarks

The Office Action mailed August 27, 2007 has been carefully considered. A Petition For A Three Month Extension accompanies this Amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 are pending. No claims have been added or cancelled. Claims 1-18 and 20-24 have been amended to make minor grammatical and language changes, and to otherwise clarify the claimed subject matter. Support for the within claim amendments may be found at, inter alia, page 15, line 16 to page 23, line 6 of the Specification.

In making the within claim amendments, Applicants are clarifying the claimed subject matter and are not acquiescing as to the validity and/or correctness of the rejections of the subject application made by the Examiner in the Office Action. The within claim amendments are not intended to, and do not result in disclaimer, waiver, and/or estoppel vis-à-vis claim scope and/or equivalents.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected various combinations of the claims under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Granik (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0010757) in view of Smyk (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,961), or as being unpatentable over Granik in view of Smyk in further view of Schleimer (U.S. Patent No. 6,108,655), Crow (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,418), Shuping (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0054114), or

technology that the Examiner asserts at pages 13-14 of the Office Action to have been "well known in the art at the time of the invention." (See Office Action, pages 13-14). Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections of the claims, as amended, cannot be maintained, and should be withdrawn.

All claim limitations must be considered material in judging the patentability of the claims against the prior art. MPEP §2143.03; *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976); *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970). Furthermore, in determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 USC §103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed combination of limitations, as a whole, would have been obvious. MPEP §2141.02; *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976). Rejections based on obviousness cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with factual rationale to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP §2141 III; *KSR International v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___ , 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Briefly, Granik discloses providing an address (URL) for downloading new advertising content that is determined based on user profile information. Smyk discloses a gateway that translates URL logical addresses to physical addresses. Schleimer discloses embedding a URL in a web page.

In a portion of Crow cited by the Examiner, Crow discloses:

FIG. 5 illustrates physical structures that the file system of FIG. 3 uses to translate between abstract files and physical data blocks. The physical structures include directories 61, 62 and inodes 63, 64. Each directory 61 translates abstract file names and directory names to physical addresses of inodes 63, 64 and directory 62, respectively. Each inode 63, 64 stores a list of extents 65-66, which map consecutive file segments to strings of physical data blocks 80-82, 84-85, 92-94.

The physical directories 61, 62 and inodes 63, 64 are stored in the global cache memory 42. Copies of the relevant directories 61, 62 and/or inodes 63, 64 may also be stored locally to volatile memory of the processors 44, 45 and drivers 47-49. The locally stored copies speed up I/O by the various local operating systems.

Each data block 80-82, 84-85, 92-94 has the same size, for example, 4K bytes. Nevertheless, the extents 65-66 can map file segments of different sizes to physical storage locations. To handle file segments of different sizes, each extent has a length field that indicates the number of data blocks in the string of data blocks that stores the associated file segment.

The various extents 65, 66 of each inode 63, 64 may map to data blocks 80-82, 84-85, 92-94 of different logical volumes LV1, LV2. For example, the extents 1 and 2 of the inode 63 map to the data blocks 80-

13

82, 84 in a first logical volume LV1, and the extent 3 of the same inode

63 maps to data blocks 92-93 in a second logical volume LV2. The

different extents 65, 66 can map different segments of a single abstract

file to different ones of the drivers 47-49 and to different physical disks

and partitions therein. (Crow, col. 3, lines 36-65).

In a portion of Shuping cited by the Examiner, Shuping discloses:

[0034] During a browsing session, user 110 accesses a particular

web page using a web browser (also referred to as web browsing engine)

such as Microsoft's Internet Explorer.TM. or Netscape's Navigator.TM.

operating on computer 120. In order to access a web page, the web

browser sends a request to a particular web site using a Uniform

Resource Locator ("URL") address associated with the desired web page.

The request is passed through network 140 using an appropriate network

protocol. For example, when network 140 comprises the Internet, a

Hyper Text Transfer Protocol ("HTTP") is used that encapsulates the

request to facilitate its transmission through network 140. Other network

protocols may also be used as would be apparent.

[0035] Using the URL address, the request is routed to a server

(or servers) 130 hosting the web page. Once located, the appropriate

server 130 analyzes the request and sends web page data corresponding

to the request back to computer 120 using the appropriate network

protocol (e.g., HTTP). The browser receives the web page data at

computer 120. This process of requesting and retrieving web page data is

well known . . .

[0038] Current panel 210 includes a current web page 215.

Current panel 210 preferably operates in a manner similar to a

conventional web browser. In a preferred embodiment of the present

invention, an active conventional web browser is mapped onto current

panel 210. From current panel 210, user 110 may access various web

pages in a conventional manner using the conventional web browser. In a

preferred embodiment of the present invention, the conventional web

browser "plugs in" to web browser 200 thereby providing web browser

200 with a web browsing engine to perform these conventional aspects

of the present invention. This concept of plugging a conventional web

browser into web browser 200 is referred to as a "reverse plug-in." Plug-

ins are generally well known. (Shuping, paragraphs 34-38).

At page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Granik and

Smyk do not disclose generating a unique file identifier by performing a hash

calculation on the contents of a file. See Office Action, page 13. However, the

Examiner asserts that "using a hash calculation on a file is a well-known and utilized

practice in the art to uniquely identify files (e.g., MD5 and RIPEMD algorithms).

Therefore, Office Notice is taken that it would have been obvious . . . to substitute a

known practice for the other to achieve the predictable result of uniquely identifying a

file." Office Action, page 14.[1]

Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Examiner's taking of Official

Notice is proper, none of the prior art of record (including that purportedly taken by

Official Notice), whether taken singly or in any combination, can be said to disclose or

suggest Applicants' claimed invention. For example, in Applicants' claimed invention

at least one storage resource locator (SRL) is utilized that comprises "a unique file

identifier generated from the contents of the file to identify the file associated with said

content, the SRL including a field generated based upon hashing involving both a

shared secret and another field of the SRL, the another field being generated based upon

a hash of the contents of the file." (Claim 1, as amended). All of the currently pending

independent claims, as amended, contain these or substantially similar limitations.

(See, e.g., claims 1,12, and 21, as amended). Thus, all of the currently pending claims,

---

[1] Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion, as well as the Examiner's taking of Official
Notice at page 14 of the Office Action based thereon, that it was well known and utilized practice in the
prior art at the time of Applicants' invention to uniquely identify files using a hash calculation. As
rationale for this traversal, *inter alia*, Applicants respectfully point out that at least some hashing
algorithms produce the same output values even when the files to which those algorithms are applied are
different from each other. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the purportedly well known facts
proffered by the Examiner by Official Notice are "not capable of instant and unquestionable
demonstration" as being actually well known. See MPEP §2144.03. Applicants therefore respectfully
request pursuant to MPEP §2144.03 that the Examiner either (1) provide a personal affidavit or prior art
document to support these factual assertions, or (2) withdraw these factual assertions.

as amended, contain these or other substantially similar limitations, either directly, or by depending from one of the independent claims. 35 USC §112, fourth paragraph.

These differences between the prior art and Applicants' claimed invention are not merely academic, as these differences permit the claimed invention to operate in a manner that is different from, and to achieve significant advantages compared to the prior art of record. For example, although the limitations in the claims, as amended, are not limited to or bound by embodiments disclosed in the Specification, in an embodiment disclosed in the Specification, these features of the claimed invention that are not disclosed or suggested in the prior art of record permit this embodiment to include a digital signature field in the SRL. In this embodiment, this digital signature field includes an authentication certificate that permits this embodiment to implement security techniques that are significantly different from, and improved compared to, the prior art of record. (See, e.g., Specification, page 5, line 18 to page 6, line 1, page 14, line 16 to page 18, line 1, page 18, line 13 to page 19, line 8, and page 21, line 11 to page 22, line 8).

Accordingly, since these advantageous features of the claimed invention are nowhere disclosed or suggested in any of the prior art of record, it is respectfully submitted that none of said art, taken singly or in any combination, renders obvious the claimed invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections of the claims, as amended, under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over the prior art of record cannot be maintained, and should be withdrawn.

In the event that the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney to initiate an interview.

In the event that any fees are due or payable in connection with this submission or in this application (including any applicable extension of time for response fees) please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-4238. Likewise, please credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer Number: 76973

/Christopher K. Gagne, Reg. No. 36,142/
Christopher K. Gagne
Reg. No. 36,142
Telephone No. (817) 281-7131